

## REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are in the application.

Claims 1-6, 12, 27-31, and 37-40 are amended.

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant's undersigned attorney conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner on June 10, 2004. During the interview, claim 1, Hazelhurst and Leshem were discussed.

Applicant noted that the words "automatically" and "content" in element (c) distinguish the references. In particular, it was noted that elements (a) and (b) generally correspond to the operation of search engines within browsers, and are intended to provide antecedent basis and context for element (c), and not particularly to distinguish the art. Element (c), on the other hand, was argued to distinguish the references of record and particularly establish patentability.

No agreement was reached, although the Examiner indicated that applicant's response would be carefully reviewed and considered. The Examiner also indicated that the extraction of the word "semantic" from claim 10, into claim 1, i.e., "semantic content" would not comprise a new issue, but no assurance was given that it would not comprise new matter.

Applicant discussed that the claim requires that the results of a search engine be automatically placed in a hierarchy, based on a content of the object. Given applicant's prior amendment, it is believed clear that the content of the object is distinguished from a linkage between objects, since the result of the amendment interpreted according to the Festo Doctrine is that the claim cannot encompass this interpretation.

Thus, the hierarchal organization was argued to be based on the intrinsic content of the object.